

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Curtis Lamar King,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	Civil Action No. 0:18-2856-BHH
v.	)	
	)	
Warden Aurthur Burton; Brian	)	
Sterling; Manthot,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
_____	)	

**ORDER**

This matter is before the Court upon Plaintiff Curtis Lamar King's pro se complaint and motion for preliminary injunction. In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2)(d) (D.S.C.), the matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge for initial review.

On March 5, 2019, Magistrate Judge Paige J. Gossett filed a Report and Recommendation ("Report") outlining the issues and recommending that the Court deny Plaintiff's motion for a preliminary injunction without prejudice to seek the relief requested in a separate lawsuit. In so recommending, the Magistrate Judge explained that the relief Plaintiff seeks in his motion for preliminary injunction does not relate to the claims Plaintiff asserts in his amended complaint. Attached to the Report was a notice advising Plaintiff of his right to file written objections to the Report within fourteen days of being served with a copy. To date, no objections have been filed.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to the Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The Court

is charged with making a de novo determination only of those portions of the Report to which specific objections are made, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In the absence of specific objections, the Court reviews the matter only for clear error. *See Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’”) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

Here, the Court has reviewed the record, the applicable law, and the findings and recommendations of the Magistrate Judge for clear error. After review, the Court finds no clear error and agrees with the Magistrate Judge’s findings and recommendation. Accordingly, the Court adopts and incorporates the Magistrate Judge’s Report (ECF No. 27) and denies Plaintiff’s motion for preliminary injunction (ECF No. 2).

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

/s/Bruce H. Hendricks  
Bruce Howe Hendricks  
United States District Judge

May 7, 2019  
Charleston, South Carolina